

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/082,518	02/22/2002		L. James Hwang	X-1002 US	5974	
24309	7590	09/10/2004		EXAMINER		
XILINX, II			WHITMORE, STACY			
ATTN: LEC		RTMENT	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
SAN JOSE,		24	2812	2812		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Appli	cation No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary			32,518	HWANG ET AL	.				
			iner	Art Unit					
			A Whitmore	2812					
<i>Th</i> e Period for Rep	MAILING DATE of this communicately No. 19	tion appears or	n the cover sheet	with the correspondence	address				
THE MAILIN - Extensions of after SIX (6) N - If the period for If NO period for Failure to reply Any reply rece	NED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA time may be available under the provisions of 3 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic or reply specified above is less than thirty (30) dayor reply is specified above, the maximum statuto y within the set or extended period for reply will, lived by the Office later than three months after the term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In ration. ays, a reply within the ry period will apply a by statute, cause the	no event, however, may e statutory minimum of t and will expire SIX (6) M e application to become	a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered ti ONTHS from the mailing date of thi ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	mely. s communication.				
Status									
1)⊠ Respo	onsive to communication(s) filed o	on <u>28 July 20</u> 0-	<u>4</u> .						
2a)∏ This a	This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.								
3) Since	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is								
closed	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of	Claims								
4)⊠ Claim	(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the applic	cation.							
4a) Of	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
·	(s) is/are allowed.								
	(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejected.								
·	(s) is/are objected to.								
8)∐ Claim	(s) are subject to restriction	n and/or election	on requirement.						
Application Pa	pers								
9)∐ The sp	ecification is objected to by the E	xaminer.	•						
	☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>22 February 2002</u> is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
	ant may not request that any objection	_	•	` '					
	ement drawing sheet(s) including the			- · · · · ·	, ,				
11)∐ The oa	ath or declaration is objected to by	tne Examiner	. Note the attach	ied Office Action or form	PTO-152.				
Priority under 3	35 U.S.C. § 119								
a)∐ All	wledgment is made of a claim for b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
	Certified copies of the priority dod								
	Certified copies of the priority doc			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
	Copies of the certified copies of the			en received in this Nation	al Stage				
	application from the International attached detailed Office action for	•	` ''	nt received					
250 110	and detailed office detail it	, a not of the t	oranoa oopies III	ot 10001900.					
Attachment(s)									
1) A Notice of Refe	erences Cited (PTO-892)			v Summary (PTO-413)					
	tsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- isclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO		Paper N	o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application (P	PTO-152)				
	Mail Date <u>6/04,7/04</u> .	//JUI/JUI/J	6) Other: _		10-102)				

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

- 2. Claims 1-3, and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman (US Patent 6,096,091) in view of Huppenthal (US Patent 6,247,110)
- 3. As for claims 1 and 7, Hartmann disclosed the invention as claimed, including a method (and machine readable storage having instruction thereon for implementing the method) for customization of a Fpga-based SoC []col. 4, lines 7-12], the method comprising:

selecting a system component used for customizing the Fpga -based SoC [col. 4, lines 57-67; fig. 2, elements 110 are system components of element 110 – integrated circuit]; configuring said selected system component with parameters for use with the Fpga - based SoC [col. 4, lines 7-12, 57-67];

propagating said parameters used to configure said selected system component to peer system components [col. 4, lines 23-28, 34-40; col. 5, lines 28-51; fig. 2 elements 110, and 120; cited portions of cols. 4 and 5 show that the system components 110 of fig. 2 propagate configurations to the next element 110]; and

configuring said peer system components using said propagated parameters during customization of the Fpga-based SoC [col. 5, lines 28-43, col. 4, lines 23-28, 34-40; col. 5, lines 28-51; fig. 2 elements 110, and 120; cited portions of cols. 4 and 5 show that the system components 110 of fig. 2 propagate configurations to the next element 110; the peer system components are the elements 110 of fig. 2 which are customized by the configurations].

Hartman does not disclose selected system component sending said parameters and configuring using said sent parameters.

Huppenthal discloses selected system component sending said parameters and configuring using said sent parameters [abstract;] col. 2, lines 12-35; col. 4, lines 8-35, and 56-58].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hartman and Huppenthal because using Huppenthal's system to send parameters from the selected system component in order to send configuration information from component to component would improve Hartman's system by eliminating the need for buffers and for internal routing resources which would improve processing of tasks faster [see Huppenthal, col. 4, lines 25-35, and 55-58].

- 4. As for claims 2 and 8, Hartmann further disclosed configuring the selected system component with parameters used to configure said peer system component [col. 5, lines 28-43].
- 5. As for claims 3 and 9, Hartmann further disclosed propagating said parameter used to configure said peer system component to subsequently selected system components used to configure the Fpga -based SoC [col. 5, lines 28-43].
- 6. As for claim 6, Hartmann further disclosed wherein the method further comprises the step of initializing only the selected system components that are utilized for customizing the FPGA-based SoC [col. 4, lines 23-28].
- 7. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (Hartmann (US Patent 6,096,091) in view of Huppenthal (US PAtent), and further in view of Cooke et al. (US Patent 5,970,254).

8. As for claims 4 and 5, Hartmann in view of Huppenthal disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, including the method of customizing an FPGA-based SoC, as cited in the rejection of claim 1 above.

Hartmann in view of Huppenthal did not specifically disclose wherein said selecting step further comprises [claim 4] the step of providing an option for selecting an implementation selected from the group consisting of a hardware implementation and a software implementation, and [claim 5] The method according Lo claim 1, wherein said step of selecting said system component further comprises selecting a system component from the group consisting of a hardware core and a software core.

Cooke disclosed selection of software and hardware implementations within an FPGA design system [col. 2, lines 1-12].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the disclosures of Hartmann in view of Huppenthal and Cooke because adding the selection of hardware and software implementations into the Hartmann in view of Huppenthal system would have improve Hartman in view of Huppenthal's system by providing customers with the advantages of both software and hardware solutions [see Cooke, col. 2, lines 1-12].

- 9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stacy A Whitmore whose telephone number is (571) 272-1685. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, alternate Friday 6:30am 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Niebling can be reached on (571) 272-1679. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Stacy A Whitmore **Primary Examiner**

MANG

Art Unit 2812

SAW